



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/530,455 | 04/05/2005 | Alexander Von Weymarn-Scharli | A013-5480 (PCT) | 2990 |
| 40627 | 7590 | 12/15/2008 | | |
| ADAMS & WILKS | | | | |
| 17 BATTERY PLACE | | | | |
| SUITE 1231 | | | | |
| NEW YORK, NY 10004 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| EISEMAN, ADAM JARED | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 3736 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 12/15/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/530,455

Applicant(s)WEYMARN-SCHARLI,
ALEXANDER VON**Examiner**

ADAM J. EISEMAN

Art Unit

3736

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 28-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 March 2008 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group II, claims 27-30, in the reply filed on 8/25/2008 is acknowledged.

Drawings

2. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because figures are hand drawn and illegible. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gereg (US 4,498,473) in view of Soukup (US 6,755,794).

Gereg discloses a device for guiding a catheter comprising and flexible sleeve inserted into a body duct (element 20); a first elongate stretchable hollow body (element 21) disposed inside the sleeve and extending lengthwise along the sleeve; plural second elongate bodies (element 19) disposed inside the sleeve around the outer circumference of the first body and extending lengthwise along the sleeve; and means for providing fluid pressure to the space between the outer sleeve (element 20) and inner elongate body (element 21) in order to stiffen the device to the desired flexibility (column 3, lines 20-35).

However, Gereg differs from the current application in that the second elongate bodies is not movable relative the first elongate body and the air pressure is provided in the space between the inner tube and outer sleeve instead of to the inner tube to press the second body against the outer sleeve.

Soukup teaches elongate bodies movable relative a central core tube (figures 1 and 2) which allows for further control of the device's rigidity (abstract).

Regarding claims 28-30; it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gereg so that the second elongate body tube was movable relative the first elongate body to provide further control of the tube flexibility.

Further regarding claim 29; it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that inflating the central first elongate member under

pressure instead of the space between the sleeve and inner elongate member would achieve the same goal of imparting rigidity to the sleeve by pressing the second elongate bodies against the sleeve. This is obvious to try as choosing from a finite number of predictable solutions with reasonable expectation of success.

Further regarding claim 30; the second elongate body disclosed in Gereg is made of a deformable material. It is inherent that the materials would undergo deformation when force is applied to push it against the sleeve.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's amendments and arguments/remarks filed 3/20/2008 were considered by the examiner, but are moot as they are concern a non-elected species.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ADAM J. EISEMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-3818. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, 8:00 PM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on (571) 272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AE
12/5/2008
/A. J. E./
Examiner, Art Unit 3736

/Max Hindenburg/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3736